

REMARKS

Examiner T. Henn, is thanked for the thorough examination and search of the subject Patent Application. Claims 1, 26, 35, and 39 have been amended. Claims 2, 5, 11, 24, 25, 27, 34, 37, and 38 have been canceled.

The making FINAL of the Restriction requirement is noted. Non-elected Claims 2, 5, 11, 24, 25, 27, 34, 37, and 38 are hereby canceled. A divisional application will be filed to Claims 2, 5, 11, 24, 25, 27, 34, 37, and 38 once the elected Claims are allowed.

All Claims are believed to be in condition for Allowance, and that is so requested.

Reconsideration of Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 12, 15, 20, 26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 35, 36, 39, and 40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hashimoto (US 4,768,085) is requested based on Amended Claims 1, 26, 35, and 39, and on the following remarks.

Applicant agrees that Hashimoto teaches an imaging sensing system. However, Applicant does not believe that Hashimoto

DYM-00-002

teaches a color imaging system with the capability of sensing a window, or sub-region, of the overall array as is taught in Applicant's present invention. In particular, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 26, 35, and 39 to include the limitation that the array controller or the method be capable of reading and processing a window of the overall array. For example, Claim 1 has been amended as follows:

1. (Currently Amended) A color imaging system for compensating a color response, the system comprising:
 - an array of pixel sensor elements;
 - a color filter including a plurality of color filter components organized in a predefined pattern, the color filter overlaying at least a portion of the array, wherein said pixel sensor elements include at least one element associated with a first color filter component, at least one element associated with a second color filter component, and at least one element associated with a third color filter component;
 - a first analog compensation unit coupled to the at least one element associated with the first color

15

filter component, said first analog compensation unit adapted to modify a readout of the at least one element associated with the first color filter component;

20

a second analog compensation unit coupled to the at least one element associated with the second color filter component, and second analog compensation unit adapted to modify a readout of the at least one element associated with the second color filter component;

25

an analog summing amplifier coupled to two elements associated with the third color filter component and outputting an analog sum of said two elements;

30

a third analog compensation unit coupled to said analog sum, said third analog compensation unit adapted to modify a readout of said analog sum; and

an array controller adapted to control the readout of the elements associated with the first, second and third color components wherein said array controller directs said readout of said first, second, and third color filter components in a selected window of said array while other sections of said array are not processed.

Claim 35 has been similarly amended. The method of Claim 26 has been amended as follows:

26. (Currently Amended) A method of compensating a color response in an analog domain of an array of pixel sensor elements, the method comprising:

amplifying an analog output from a plurality of
5 elements of a first color component;

amplifying an analog output from a plurality of elements of a second color component wherein two said element outputs are summed together prior to said amplifying; and

10 generating a compensated analog readout of the plurality of elements of the first color component
wherein only a selected window of said array is processed while other sections of said array are not processed.

Claim 39 has been similarly amended.

The above recited amended Claims are supported in the original Specification on, for example, pages 13-14 in regards to Fig. 4 and page 18 in regards to Fig. 10. Therefore,

DYM-00-002

Applicant regards this embodiment as being part of the present invention disclosed in the original application.

By comparison, Hashimoto does not appear to teach accessing a window, or sub-region, of the overall array. Hashimoto appears to only teach the formation of frame images (col. 1, lines 55 to 60). Therefore, Applicant believes that Amended Claims 1, 26, 35, and 39 teach an element not taught in the cited art of Hashimoto and that, on this basis, Claims 1, 26, 35, and 39 should not be rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hashimoto. In addition, Claims 3, 4, 6, 12, 15, 20, 28, 29, 31, 33, 36, and 40 represent patentably distinct, further limitations on Claims 1, 26, 35, and 39 and should not be rejected if the grounds for rejecting Claims 1, 26, 35, and 39 are removed.

Reconsideration of Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 12, 15, 20, 26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 35, 36, 39, and 40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hashimoto (US 4,768,085) is requested based on Amended Claims 1, 26, 35, and 39, and on the above remarks.

Reconsideration of Claims 7, 8, 30 and 32 rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of

DYM-00-002

Boisvert et al (US 5,329,312) is requested based on Amended Claims 1 and 26 and on the following remarks.

As discussed above, Applicant believes that Amended Claims 1 and 26 now include limitations not taught in the cited art of Hashimoto. Further, it appears to the Applicant that Hashimoto neither teaches nor suggests the limitation of reading a window or sub-region of the overall array as is taught in Applicant's claimed invention. Further yet, Applicant has reviewed Boisvert et al and believes that this cited art also does not teach or suggest this limitation. Therefore, Applicant believes that the cited art of Hashimoto in view of Boisvert does not teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention, as recited in Amended Claims 1 and 26, such that one of skill in the art could have practiced this invention at the time. In addition, Applicant believes that Claims 7, 8, 30, and 32 represent patentably distinct, further limitations on Claims 1 and 26 that should not be rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Boisvert et al.

Reconsideration of Claims 7, 8, 30 and 32 rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Boisvert et al (US 5,329,312) is requested based on Amended Claims 1 and 26 and on the above remarks.

Reconsideration of Claims 9 and 10 rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Boisvert et al (US 5,329,312) and further in view of Zhou et al (IEEE) is requested based on Amended Claim 1 and on the following remarks.

As discussed above, Applicant believes that Amended Claim 1 now includes a limitation not taught in the cited art of Hashimoto. Further, it appears to the Applicant that Hashimoto neither teaches nor suggests the limitation of reading a window or sub-region of the overall array as is taught in Applicant's claimed invention. Further yet, Applicant has reviewed Boisvert et al and believes that this cited art also does not teach or suggest this limitation. Further yet, Applicant has reviewed Zhou et al and believes that this cited art also does not teach or suggest this limitation. Therefore, Applicant believes that the cited art of Hashimoto in view of Boisvert and further in view of Zhou et al do not teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention, as recited in Amended Claim 1, such that one of skill in the art could have practiced this invention at the time. In addition, Applicant believes that Claims 9 and 10 represent patentably distinct, further limitations on Claim 1 that should not be rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over

DYM-00-002

Hashimoto in view of Boisvert et al and further in view of Zhou et al.

Reconsideration of Claims 9 and 10 rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Boisvert et al (US 5,329,312) and further in view of Zhou et al (IEEE) is requested based on Amended Claim 1 and on the above remarks.

Reconsideration of Claims 13, 14, 16-19, 21 and 22 rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto is requested based on Amended Claim 1 and on the following remarks.

As discussed above, Applicant believes that Amended Claim 1 now includes a limitation not taught in the cited art of Hashimoto. Further, it appears to the Applicant that Hashimoto neither teaches nor suggests the limitation of reading a window or sub-region of the overall array as is taught in Applicant's claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant believes that the cited art of Hashimoto does not teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention, as recited in Amended Claim 1, such that one of skill in the art could have practiced this invention at the time. In addition, Applicant believes that Claims 13, 14, 16-19, 21 and 22 represent patentably distinct, further limitations on Claim 1

DYM-00-002

that should not be rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Hashimoto.

Reconsideration of Claims 13, 14, 16-19, 21 and 22 rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto is requested based on Amended Claim 1 and on the above remarks.

Reconsideration of Claim 23 rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Sano et al (IEEE) is requested based on Amended Claim 1 and on the following remarks.

As discussed above, Applicant believes that Amended Claim 1 now includes limitations not taught in the cited art of Hashimoto. Further, it appears to the Applicant that Hashimoto neither teaches nor suggests the limitation of reading a window or sub-region of the overall array as is taught in Applicant's claimed invention. Further yet, Applicant has reviewed Sano et al and believes that this cited art also does not teach or suggest this limitation. Therefore, Applicant believes that the cited art of Hashimoto in view of Sano et al does not teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention, as recited in Amended Claim 1, such that one of skill in the art could have practiced this invention at the time. In addition, Applicant believes that

DYM-00-002

Claim 23 represents a patentably distinct, further limitation on Claims 1 that should not be rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Sano et al.

Reconsideration of Claim 23 rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Sano et al (IEEE) is requested based on Amended Claim 1 and on the above remarks.

Applicants have reviewed the prior art made of record and not relied upon and have discussed their impact on the present invention above.

Allowance of all Claims is requested.

It is requested that should the Examiner not find that the Claims are now Allowable that the Examiner call the undersigned at 989-894-4392 to overcome any problems preventing allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas R. Schnabel, Reg. No. 47,927